

not be punished. And yet, "what son is he whom the Father chasteneth not"? David's child died. And further, Nathan told David that "the sword shall never depart from thy house." It did not depart. It shadowed his whole life. The experiences of Tamar, of Amnon, of Absalom and of Adonijah were a ceaseless grief to him. And they followed him to his grave. We can hardly fail to feel that the cry, "Why art thou cast down, oh my soul"? lingered on his lips unto the hour of death. Up to the end of life, he could but anticipate that in generations to follow, the sword would not depart from his house; for it did not. Ahaziah perished by the sword of Jehu; Ahaziah's children died by the hand of Athaliah; and Joash by the violence of his own servants. While such anticipations were on the heart of David, he did indeed rest sure that his sin was pardoned; but how could he have comfort?

In these events the distressed ones of earth may find an explanation of their want of comfort. God is using chastisement. Not in anger, but "for our profit." He did it unto David because he would make him a "man after God's own heart." He would fit him to sit on a heavenly throne alongside of the Lord Jesus. He chastens us also for our profit. "Without holiness, no man shall see the Lord," and he chastens us "for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness."

If a man has lived in worldliness, and then the Lord should fail to give him experience of sorrow, might he not fear that God was not dealing with him as a son? "Aliens may escape the rod," but the true born child of God must not. And as the hymn says, he "would not if he might."

There is a difference between the peace of God and comfort. The peace follows God's pardon. The comfort follows the termination of the chastisement. Little chastisement may mean little growth and development in holiness. But the man, Moses, whom God was preparing to honor on the Mount of Transfiguration, was disciplined on earth even to the hour of his death, and his final petition that he might go over Jordan was rejected. It was not because God loved him less, but because God loved him more.

THE MISSIONARY CRISIS IN AFRICA.

The Trial of Morrison and Sheppard.

For several months there has been much prayer by the Christians of this land in behalf of Messrs. Morrison and Sheppard, our missionaries in Africa. They found the natives in that land grievously oppressed by the representatives of the Congo Free State, or the commercial agencies chartered by it. They had been robbed of their lands, had been compelled to labor without remuneration, and had suffered the loss of their right hands (and in some cases of life) if they failed to deliver the amount of rubber that was demanded. Our missionaries reported these things to the Christian world. Then agents of the government of Great Britain investigated and found matters even worse than our missionaries had reported.

The reports resulted in some limitation of the wrongs; and, by consequence, in some limitations of the profits of the companies. They then brought suit for criminal libel against the two missionaries named

in this article. The punishment might be a fine of fifteen thousand dollars or it might be imprisonment. The trial was set for the last of June, but, by reason of low water in the Congo river, it was impossible for the government agents to serve notices, or for our missionaries to reach the place, Leopoldville, where the trial was to be held. A new date was set, September 24. During the weeks that ensued many prayers have been made that God would defend his servants.

We hear that the trial has now been held in part. In the "Augusta Chronicle" of September 23, we read, that the charges against Rev. W. M. Morrison have been withdrawn, but that the plaintiffs, (the India Rubber Company) reserve the right to bring suit later for damages.

The case against Rev. W. H. Sheppard has been set for October 4. The statement before us refers to it, however not as a suit for criminal libel, but only a suit for six thousand dollars for damages.

We had not expected to hear so soon of the outcome of the trial. God's people can see how their petitions have availed. To him be thanksgiving.

TITUS WAS NOT CIRCUMCISED.

But Timothy Was.

Why did Paul make this distinction between the two? This question is sent by a correspondent, who asks for information.

The record concerning the case of Titus is found in the second chapter of Galatians, and reads thus: "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, and that because of false brethren . . . who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." This we understand to refer to the events which preceded the Council at Jerusalem, which is recorded in the fifteen of Acts, and which decided that circumcision was not essential to membership in the Christian Church.

The record concerning Timothy is found in the earlier verses of the sixteenth of Acts. It is one of the events of the second missionary journey of Paul and is subsequent to the decision of the Council at Jerusalem. It is in these words: "Then came he to Derbe and Lystra, and behold a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus." His mother was a Jewess, but his father was a Greek. Paul "took and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters, for they knew all that his father was a Greek."

What are the distinctions between these cases? Why should the ordinance be refused in the one case and be observed in the other?

In the former case, that of Titus, the question of a demand that he conform to the Mosaic ritual, as a condition of membership in the Christian Church, was open and urgent. The Judaizing teachers were insistent that no one should be recognized among the disciples unless he had entered through the ordinances of Judaism. But the vision of Peter (recorded in the tenth of Acts, and repeated in the eleventh chapter) was to the effect that God had granted to the Gentiles direct access to the privileges of the Church without the intervention of Jewish ceremonies. When Paul